```
1
                    IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
  2
                   FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA
  3
  4
     STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel,
     W.A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his
  5
     capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL )
     OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
 6
     et al.
  7
                    Plaintiffs,
 8
     vs.
                                           CASE NO. 05-CV-329-GKF-PJC
 9
     TYSON FOODS, INC., et al.,
10
11
                    Defendants.
12
13
14
                         TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
15
                               JULY 28, 2009
        BEFORE THE HONORABLE GREGORY K. FRIZZELL, DISTRICT JUDGE
16
                        MOTION HEARING, VOLUME I
17
18
    APPEARANCES:
19
20
    For the Plaintiffs:
                                       MR. DAVID RIGGS
21
                                       MR. DAVID P. PAGE
                                       MR. RICHARD T. GARREN
22
                                       Riggs Abney Neal Turpen
                                       Orbison & Lewis
23
                                       502 W. 6th Street
                                       Tulsa, OK 74119
24
25
```

Terri Beeler, RMR, FCRR United States Court Reporter 333 W. 4th St. Tulsa, OK 74103 * 918-699-4877 a relationship between poultry marker and fecal indicator must take into account the expected level of poultry contamination.

Dr. Harwood's conclusions regarding risks to human health in the IRW from fecal indicator bacteria from poultry litter are unsupported by the data.

For instance, 80 percent of campylobacter illness and 95 percent of salmonella illness is food borne, not waterborne. Moreover, as one peer reviewer stated, "The relationship of fecal indicators with human health risk was developed at sites contaminated primarily with human waste. This relationship is not expected to be the same for water contaminated with feces from nonhuman sources." That's from the peer review.

In contrary to the argument that Dr. Harwood reached her health risk conclusion independent from her work on the biomarker, her Rule 26 report recognizes that the biomarker is her link between poultry litter and allegations of health risk from human pathogens such as salmonella and campylobacter.

Moreover, Dr. Harwood's proposed article stated that the magnitude of the impact cannot be quantified with the limited number of environmental samples processed.

Now, that still raises the issue and does not address the issue raised by Mr. Page as to whether she might be able to testify to other more generalized health risks from fecal indicator bacteria, and I'm not deciding that here today.